



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,013	11/17/2003	Dale W. Conkel	LEDS.00116	3282

38851 7590 09/06/2006

GARDERE/EDS
GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
3000 THANKSGIVING TOWER
1601 ELM STREET
DALLAS, TX 75201-4761

EXAMINER

MCCARTHY, CHRISTOPHER S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2113

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/715,013		CONKEL, DALE W.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Christopher S. McCarthy		2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 9 recites a computer program product in a computer readable medium; however, the applicant's specification defines a computer readable medium as including transmission-type media such as digital and analog communications links. Data, which is on a transmission link, is deemed a signal and is not tangible. The applicant is urged to include tangible language in the claim or to modify the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 14 and 22 recite the limitation "the step" in the claim language. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Parent claims 9 and 17 do not recite the "step" as claimed in the respective dependent claims since they are not written as method claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2113

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cassidy.

As per claim 25, Cassidy teaches a graphical user interface for providing a user with information concerning a domain controller replication process in a directory service environment (column 7, lines 48-54), the graphical user interface comprising: visual representations of domain controllers within the environment; and visual indicia indicating an identity of a domain controller's replication partner (column 15, line 44 – column 16, line 4; column 16, line 65 – column 17, line 12); wherein the visual indicia indicate whether errors in the replication process exist between the domain controller and the domain controller's replication partner (column 17, lines 9-21, wherein, if a time limit is exceeded a problem is detected and an alert is sent; the time limit can be exceeded by a failure, such as taught in column 2, lines 52-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 1-6, 9-14, 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassidy et al. U.S. Patent 6,249,883 in view of Ghaffar et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication US2004/0176964A1.

As per claim 1, Cassidy teaches a method for monitoring replication of domain controllers and problems with replication within a directory service environment (column 2, lines

39-51; column 5, lines 60-62), the method comprising: querying the director service for replication information (column 5, lines 1-22); determining whether an error exist (column 2, lines 39-51); and visually displaying information regarding the progress of the domain controller replication process, wherein the information includes the identity of domain controller replication partners and the status of the replication process between any two domain controller replication partners (column 7, lines 48-51; column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 7; column 14, lines 36-54). Cassidy does not explicitly teach correcting the error if an error exists. Ghaffer does teach correcting the error if an error exists (paragraph 0010, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffer teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 2, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the method-as recited in claim 1. Cassidy does not explicitly teach wherein correcting the error if an error exists comprises: consulting a knowledge base to determine whether an entry for an error type associated with the error exists in the knowledge base, wherein the knowledge base contains entries for error types

Art Unit: 2113

and associated corrective actions; and taking corrective actions identified by the knowledge base as associated with the error type if the error type is found in the knowledge base. Ghaffar does teach wherein correcting the error if an error exists comprises: consulting a knowledge base to determine whether an entry for an error type associated with the error exists in the knowledge base, wherein the knowledge base contains entries for error types and associated corrective actions; and taking corrective actions identified by the knowledge base as associated with the error type if the error type is found in the knowledge base (paragraph 0022, 0024). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffar teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 3, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the method as recited in claim 2. Cassidy does not explicitly teach the method further comprising: prior to taking corrective action, determining whether the corrective action is authorized under conditions as currently exist in the director service environment. Ghaffar does teach the method further comprising: prior to taking corrective action, determining whether the corrective action is authorized under

Art Unit: 2113

conditions as currently exist in the director service environment (paragraph 0021, wherein, authorized, proper code must be provided to perform any correction process). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffer teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 4, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the method as recited in claim 1. Cassidy does not teach the method further comprising: paging support personnel if it is determined that the corrective action has failed to resolve the error. Ghaffar does teach the method further comprising: paging support personnel if it is determined that the corrective action has failed to resolve the error (paragraph 0007, 0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffer teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the

Art Unit: 2113

reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 5, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the method as recited in claim 4. Cassidy does not teach the method further comprising: logging information regarding the nature of the error, failed corrective action taken, and personnel paged. Ghaffar does teach the method further comprising: logging information regarding the nature of the error, failed corrective action taken, and personnel paged (paragraph 0021-0022, 0024, 0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffar teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 6, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teach the method as recited in claim 1. Cassidy teaches wherein the step of visually displaying information regarding the progress of the

Art Unit: 2113

domain controller replication process comprises graphical indicia of relationships between domain controller partners (column 14, lines 36-54; column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 7; column 15, lines 44-60).

As per claim 9, Cassidy teaches a computer program product in a computer readable media for use in a data processing system for monitoring replication of domain controllers and problems with replication within a directory service environment (column 2, lines 39-51; column 5, lines 60-62), the computer program product comprising: first instructions for querying the director service for replication information (column 5, lines 1-22); second instructions for determining whether an error exist (column 2, lines 29-51); and fourth instructions for visually displaying information regarding the progress of the domain controller replication process, wherein the information includes the identity of domain controller replication partners and the status of the replication process between any two domain controller replication partners (column 7, lines 48-51; column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 7; column 14, lines 36-54). Cassidy does not explicitly teach instructions for correcting the error if an error exists. Ghaffar does teach instructions for correcting the error if an error exists (paragraph 0010, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffer teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of

Art Unit: 2113

performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66).

Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 10, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the computer program product as recited in claim 9. Cassidy does not teach wherein correcting the error if an error exists comprises: fifth instructions for consulting a knowledge base to determine whether an entry for an error type associated with the error exists in the knowledge base, wherein the knowledge base contains entries for error types and associated corrective actions; and sixth instructions for taking corrective actions identified by the knowledge base as associated with the error type if the error type is found in the knowledge base. Ghaffar does teach wherein correcting the error if an error exists comprises: fifth instructions for consulting a knowledge base to determine whether an entry for an error type associated with the error exists in the knowledge base, wherein the knowledge base contains entries for error types and associated corrective actions; and sixth instructions for taking corrective actions identified by the knowledge base as associated with the error type if the error type is found in the knowledge base (paragraph 0022, 0024). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffer teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of

Art Unit: 2113

performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66).

Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 11, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the computer program product as recited in claim 10. Cassidy does not teach the further comprising: seventh instructions for determining whether the corrective action is authorized under conditions as currently exist in the director service environment prior to taking corrective action. Ghaffar does teach the further comprising: seventh instructions for determining whether the corrective action is authorized under conditions as currently exist in the director service environment prior to taking corrective action (paragraph 0021-0022). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffar teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 12, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar the computer program product as recited in claim 9. Cassidy does not teach the further comprising: fifth instructions for paging support

Art Unit: 2113

personnel if it is determined that the corrective action has failed to resolve the error. Ghaffar does teach the further comprising: fifth instructions for paging support personnel if it is determined that the corrective action has failed to resolve the error (paragraph 0007, 0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffar teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 13, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar the computer program product as recited in claim 12. Cassidy does not teach the further comprising: sixth instructions for logging information regarding the nature of the error, failed corrective action taken, and personnel paged. Ghaffar does teach the further comprising: sixth instructions for logging information regarding the nature of the error, failed corrective action taken, and personnel paged (paragraph 0011, 0022). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction

Art Unit: 2113

process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffer teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 14, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the computer program product as recited in claim 9. Cassidy teaches wherein the step of visually displaying information regarding the progress of the domain controller replication process comprises graphical indicia of relationships between domain controller partners (column 14, lines 36-54; column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 7; column 15, lines 44-50).

As per claim 17, Cassidy teaches a system for monitoring replication of domain controllers and problems with replication within a directory service environment (column 2, lines 39-51; column 5, lines 60-62), the system comprising: first means for querying the director service for replication information (column 5, lines 1-5); second means for determining whether an error exist (column 2, lines 39-51); and fourth means for visually displaying information regarding the progress of the domain controller replication process, wherein the information includes the identity of domain controller replication partners and the status of the replication process between any two domain controller replication partners (column 7, lines 48-51; column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 7; column 14, lines 36-54). Cassidy does not explicitly teach a means

Art Unit: 2113

for correcting the error if an error exists. Ghaffar does teach a means for correcting the error if an error exists (paragraph 0010, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffar teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 18, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the system as recited in claim 17. Cassidy does not teach wherein correcting the error if an error exists comprises: fifth means for consulting a knowledge base to determine whether an entry for an error type associated with the error exists in the knowledge base, wherein the knowledge base contains entries for error types and associated corrective actions; and sixth means for taking corrective actions identified by the knowledge base as associated with the error type if the error type is found in the knowledge base. Ghaffar does teach wherein correcting the error if an error exists comprises: fifth means for consulting a knowledge base to determine whether an entry for an error type associated with the error exists in the knowledge base, wherein the knowledge base contains entries for error types and associated corrective actions; and sixth means for taking corrective actions identified by the

Art Unit: 2113

knowledge base as associated with the error type if the error type is found in the knowledge base (paragraph 0022, 0024). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffer teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 19, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the system as recited in claim 18. Cassidy does not teach the further comprising: seventh means for determining whether the corrective action is authorized under conditions as currently exist in the director service environment prior to taking corrective action. Ghaffar does teach the further comprising: seventh means for determining whether the corrective action is authorized under conditions as currently exist in the director service environment prior to taking corrective action (paragraph 0021-0022). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffer in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffer teaches

Art Unit: 2113

the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 20, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the system as recited in claim 17. Cassidy does not teach the further comprising: fifth means for paging support personnel if it is determined that the corrective action has failed to resolve the error. Ghaffar does teach the further comprising: fifth means for paging support personnel if it is determined that the corrective action has failed to resolve the error (paragraph 0007, 0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffar teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 21, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the system as recited in claim 20. Cassidy does not teach the further comprising: sixth means for logging information regarding the nature of the error, failed corrective action taken, and personnel paged. Ghaffar does teach the further comprising: sixth means for logging information regarding the nature of the error, failed corrective action taken, and personnel paged (paragraph 0011, 0022). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the failure correction process of Ghaffar in the failure detection process of Cassidy because Ghaffar teaches the importance of an information handling system (which is taught to include a network storage device in paragraph 0018) to work properly to assure the reduction of failure occurrences in the operation of the systems (paragraph 0014); this is an explicit desire of Cassidy, in that, Cassidy teaches the desire of improvement of performance (column 1, lines 5-9) in a network data storage device (column 2, lines 64-66). Cassidy's improvement of performance desire would be greatly enhanced if the failures taught in his invention (column 2, lines 52-63) be corrected by an invention such as the Ghaffar invention.

As per claim 22, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the system as recited in claim 17. Cassidy teaches wherein the step of visually displaying information regarding the progress of the domain controller replication process comprises graphical indicia of relationships between domain controller partners (column 14, lines 36-54; column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 7; column 15, lines 44-50).

7. Claims 7-8, 15-16, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassidy in view of Ghaffar as applied to claims 1,9, and 17 above, and further in view of Bazerman et al. U.S. Patent 6,850,253.

As per claim 7, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the method as recited in claim 6. Cassidy in view of Ghaffar does not teach wherein the indicia comprises a line. Bazerman teaches wherein the indicia comprises a line (column 1, lines 62-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

As per claim 8, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar does not teach the method as recited in claim 7, wherein the nature of the progress and severity of any errors related to the replication process between domain controller replication partners is indicated by color wherein different colors represent different levels of errors and lack of errors. Bazerman does teach the method as recited in claim 7, wherein the nature of the progress and severity of any errors related to the replication process between domain controller replication partners is indicated by color wherein different colors represent different levels of errors and lack of errors (column 6, lines 34-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because

Art Unit: 2113

Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

As per claim 15, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the computer program product as recited in claim 14. Cassidy in view of Ghaffar does not teach wherein the indicia comprises a line. Bazerman teaches wherein the indicia comprises a line (column 1, lines 62-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

As per claim 16, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar does not teach the computer program product as recited in claim 15, wherein the nature of the progress and severity of any errors related to the replication process between domain controller replication partners is indicated by color wherein different colors represent different levels of errors and lack of errors. Bazerman does teach the computer program product as recited in claim 15, wherein the nature of the progress and severity of any errors related to the replication process between domain controller replication partners is indicated by color wherein different colors represent different levels of errors and lack of errors (column 6, lines 34-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia

Art Unit: 2113

of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

As per claim 23, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar teaches the system as recited in claim 22. Cassidy in view of Ghaffar does not teach wherein the indicia comprises a line. Bazerman teaches wherein the indicia comprises a line (column 1, lines 62-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

As per claim 24, Cassidy in view of Ghaffar does not teach the system as recited in claim 23, wherein the nature of the progress and severity of any errors related to the replication process between domain controller replication partners is indicated by color wherein different colors

Art Unit: 2113

represent different levels of errors and lack of errors. Bazerman does teach the system as recited in claim 23, wherein the nature of the progress and severity of any errors related to the replication process between domain controller replication partners is indicated by color wherein different colors represent different levels of errors and lack of errors (column 6, lines 34-43).

8. Claims 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassidy in view of Bazerman.

As per claim 26, Cassidy teaches the graphical user interface as recited in claim 25. Cassidy does not teach wherein the visual representations comprise icons. Bazerman does teach wherein the visual representations comprise icons (column 5, lines 31-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

As per claim 27, Cassidy teaches the graphical user interface as recited in claim 25, wherein the visual representations comprise representations of domain controllers (column 16, lines 31-37). Cassidy does not teach wherein the representations are pictorial. Bazerman does teach wherein the representations are pictorial (column 5, lines 31-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

Art Unit: 2113

motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

As per claim 28, Cassidy teaches the graphical user interface as recited in claim 25. Cassidy does not explicitly teach wherein the visual indicia comprises a line between a domain controller and the domain controller's replication partner. Bazerman does teach wherein the visual indicia comprises a line between a domain controller and the domain controller's replication partner (figure 3, wherein the network device is the domain controller device of Cassidy). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

As per claim 29, Cassidy teaches the graphical user interface as recited in claim 28. Cassidy does not teach wherein the line is one of a solid bold line, a dashed bold line, and a solid unbold line, wherein each of the solid bold line, dashed bold line, and solid unbold line represent different performance levels of the replication process. Bazerman does teach wherein the line is one of a solid bold line, a dashed bold line, and a solid unbold line, wherein each of the solid bold line, dashed bold line, and solid unbold line represent different performance levels of the replication process (column 6, lines 35-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

As per claim 30, Cassidy teaches the graphical user interface as recited in claim 28. Cassidy does not teach wherein differing line colors represent different performance levels of the replication process between the domain controller and the domain controller's replication partner. Bazerman does teach wherein differing line colors represent different performance levels of the replication process between the domain controller and the domain controller's replication partner (column 6, lines 35-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the indicia of Bazerman in the visual display of Cassidy because Bazerman teaches the benefit of the enablement of using a GUI in a network to monitor performance of the system and to diagnose faults thereof (column 1, lines 20-25); and explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54; column 1, lines 5-8).

9. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassidy in view of Fu U.S. Patent Application Publication US2005/00444502A1.

As per claim 31, Cassidy teaches the graphical user interface as recited in claim 25. Cassidy does not teach wherein at least one of the visual representations and visual indicia are

Art Unit: 2113

selectable by a user to provide additional information about the replication progress. Fu does teach wherein at least one of the visual representations and visual indicia are selectable by a user to provide additional information about the replication progress (paragraph 0009). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the GUI of Fu in the process of Cassidy. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the GUI of Fu in the process of Cassidy because Fu teaches the benefit of using a GUI to assist the operator to troubleshoot network problems to improve speed and therefore performance (paragraph 0043); an explicit desire of Cassidy (column 7, lines 48-54).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: See attached PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. McCarthy whose telephone number is (571)272-3651. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571)272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Christopher S. McCarthy
Examiner
Art Unit 2113